REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed May 21, 2003, has been received and reviewed. Claims 6, 7, 9 through 13, 15, and 16 are currently pending in the application. Claims 6, 7, 9 through 12, and 15 are allowed. Claim 13 stands rejected. Claim 16 has been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but the indication of allowable subject matter in such claim is noted with appreciation. Applicants have cancelled claim 16, amended claim 13 and respectfully request reconsideration of the application as amended herein.

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Anticipation Rejections

Anticipation Rejection Based on U.S. Patent No. 5,468,991 to Lee et al.

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lee et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,468,991). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Brothers v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Applicants have amended claim 13 herein to include the subject matter previously set forth in dependent claim 16, which subject matter has been indicated by the Examiner as containing allowable subject matter. Applicants, therefore, submit that claim 13 is allowable over Lee and respectfully requests reconsideration thereof.

Anticipation Rejection Based on U.S. Patent No. 5,521,427 to Chia et al.

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Chia et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,521,427). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

Applicants have amended claim 13 herein to include the subject matter previously set forth in dependent claim 16, which subject matter has been indicated by the Examiner as

containing allowable subject matter. Applicants, therefore, submit that claim 13 is allowable over Chia and respectfully requests reconsideration thereof.

Anticipation Rejection Based on U.S. Patent No. 5,728,601 to Sato et al.

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sato et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,728,601). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

Applicants have amended claim 13 herein to include the subject matter previously set forth in dependent claim 16, which subject matter has been indicated by the Examiner as containing allowable subject matter. Applicants, therefore, submit that claim 13 is allowable over Sato and respectfully requests reconsideration thereof.

Objection to Claim 16/Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 16 stands objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but is indicated to contain allowable subject matter and would be allowable if placed in appropriate independent form. As noted above, claim 13 has been amended to include the subject matter previously set forth in claim 16 (i.e., prior to the present amendment). Applicants, therefore, submit that claim 13 is allowable and request reconsideration thereof.

ENTRY OF AMENDMENTS

The amendments to claim 13 above should be entered by the Examiner because the amendments are supported by the as-filed specification and drawings and do not add any new matter to the application.

CONCLUSION

Claims 6, 7, 9, 13 and 15 are believed to be in condition for allowance, and an early notice thereof is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner determine that additional issues remain which might be resolved by a telephone conference, he is respectfully invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Bradley B. Jensen

Registration No. 46,801

Attorney for Applicant(s)

TRASKBRITT

P.O. Box 2550

Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550

Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: August 15, 2003

BBJ/ps:djp
Document in ProLaw